

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

Jaime Contreras,

Plaintiff,

v.

Hunter Warfield, Inc.; and DOES 1-10,
inclusive,

Defendants.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

Civil Action No.: _____

COMPLAINT

For this Complaint, Plaintiff, Jaime Contreras, by undersigned counsel, states as follows:

JURISDICTION

1. This action arises out of Defendants' repeated violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq. (the "FDCPA").
2. Supplemental jurisdiction exists pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
3. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), in that Defendants transact business in this District and a substantial portion of the acts giving rise to this action occurred in this District.

PARTIES

4. Plaintiff, Jaime Contreras ("Plaintiff"), is an adult individual residing in College Park, Maryland, and is a "consumer" as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).
5. Defendant, Hunter Warfield, Inc. ("Hunter"), is a Maryland business entity with an address of 96931 Arlington Road, Suite 400, Bethesda, Maryland 20814, operating as a collection agency, and is a "debt collector" as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).
6. Does 1-10 (the "Collectors") are individual collectors employed by Hunter and whose identities are currently unknown to Plaintiff. One or more of the Collectors may be joined

as parties once their identities are disclosed through discovery.

7. Hunter at all times acted by and through one or more of the Collectors.

ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS

A. The Debt

8. Plaintiff allegedly incurred a financial obligation (the “Debt”) to an original creditor (the “Creditor”).

9. The Debt arose from services provided by the Creditor which were primarily for family, personal or household purposes, which meets the definition of a “debt” under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).

10. The Debt was purchased, assigned or transferred to Hunter for collection, or Hunter was employed by the Creditor to collect the Debt.

11. Defendants attempted to collect the Debt and, as such, engaged in “communications” as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).

B. Hunter Engages in Harassment and Abusive Tactics

12. In February 2016, Hunter called Plaintiff’s place of employment and spoke with his supervisor in an attempt to collect the Debt.

13. Hunter did not attempt to confirm or correct Plaintiff’s location information.

14. Instead, Hunter used Plaintiff’s supervisor as a messenger by asking him to provide a callback number to Plaintiff.

C. Plaintiff Suffered Actual Damages

15. Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer actual damages as a result of Defendants’ unlawful conduct.

16. As a direct consequence of Defendants’ acts, practices and conduct, Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer from humiliation, anger, fear, frustration and embarrassment.

COUNT I
VIOLATIONS OF THE FDCPA 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq.

17. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

18. Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692b(1) in that Defendants contacted Plaintiff's supervisor for a purpose other than to confirm or correct location information.

19. Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(b) in that Defendants communicated with Plaintiff's supervisor.

20. Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d in that Defendants engaged in behavior the natural consequence of which was to harass, oppress, or abuse Plaintiff in connection with collection of the Debt.

21. Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692f in that Defendants used unfair and unconscionable means to collect the Debt.

22. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous and multiple violations of the FDCPA.

23. Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of Defendant's violations.

COUNT II
VIOLATIONS OF THE MARYLAND CONSUMER DEBT COLLECTION ACT
MD. CODE COMM. LAW § 14-201, et seq.

24. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

25. Defendants are each individually a "collector" as defined under MD. Code Comm. Law § 14-201(b).

26. The debt is a "consumer transaction" as defined under MD. Code Comm. Law § 14-201(c).

27. Defendants contacted Plaintiff's employer, without having received a final judgment from a court, in violation of MD. Code Comm. Law § 14-202(4).

28. Plaintiff is entitled to damages proximately caused by Defendants' violations.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against Defendants:

1. Actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);
2. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A);
3. Costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3);
4. Actual damages pursuant to MD. Code Comm. Law § 14-203;
5. Actual damages pursuant to MD. Ann. Code. Bus. Reg. § 7-401(b);
6. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS

Dated: October 12, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

By /s/ Sergei Lemberg
Sergei Lemberg, Esq.
LEMBERG LAW, L.L.C.
43 Danbury Road, 3rd Floor
Wilton, CT 06897
Telephone: (203) 653-2250
Facsimile: (203) 653-3424
ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF